

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE EATON OF CALIFORNIA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolution (H. Res. 301) was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
September 21, 1939.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. THOMAS M. EATON, a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in the absence of the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who is detained on official business, I submit the resolution which I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 187) was read, considered, by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. THOMAS M. EATON, late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move, on behalf of the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order previously entered, until Monday, October 2, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1939

The House was called to order at 12 o'clock noon by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. RAYBURN.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, as we pause on the threshold of this new day, we turn to Thee in praise and adoration. Let us not fail to realize that amid the turmoil of this outward world Thou art ever present to give rest and quiet to the inner life. Humble us in our pride, lift us from our despondency, keep our hearts pure and our lips from speaking guile. In all our ways make us not ashamed to be good, forgiving, and gentle. Blessed Lord, forgive us when we are selfish, recall us when we go astray, and save us from wronging ourselves by thinking ill of others. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, September 25, 1939, was read and approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS].

THE LATE RONALD L. JOHNSTON

Mr. WILLIAMS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret to announce the passing of a former Member of this House, Hon. Ronald L. Johnston, of Rolla, Mo. He died last Friday, September 22, at the age of 67 years.

Mr. Johnston was born in Louisiana, Mo., and in early life went to St. Louis County, which he represented for three terms in the Missouri Legislature. He also served the people of that county for three terms as prosecuting attorney. After that he was assistant circuit attorney of the city of St. Louis for a period of 5 years.

After 17 years of public service in and around the city of St. Louis, Mr. Johnston moved to south central Missouri, and in 1928 was elected from the old Sixteenth Missouri District to Congress. He served in this body during the Seventy-first Congress. After retiring he resumed the practice of law, in which profession he had a long and a very successful career. He was very active and influential in Masonic circles and in

Republican politics. He leaves surviving him his widow and two children.

In the death of Ronald Johnston Missouri has lost one of its favorite sons and the Nation has lost an able and a good man.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER].

THE LATE JOHN SANFORD

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a keen sense of regret that I announce the death of the Honorable John Sanford, of Amsterdam, N. Y., on September 26, 1939. He served as a Member of the House of Representatives during the Fifty-first and Fifty-second Congresses, March 4, 1889, to March 3, 1893, and was born at Amsterdam, N. Y., January 18, 1851.

He attended the common schools and the Poughkeepsie Military Institute and was graduated from Yale College in 1872; engaged in the carpet manufacturing industry with his father in Amsterdam, N. Y., and after leaving Congress he resumed his business pursuits. He was a delegate to the Republican National Convention at Minneapolis in 1892, a Presidential elector on the Republican ticket of McKinley and Hobart in 1896, and was for many years a member of the New York Racing Commission.

Our State has lost a loyal and devoted citizen, and his hometown folks will mourn the passing of one of its outstanding pioneers, a man of unimpeachable character and sterling integrity.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some tables with reference to exports and imports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. VREELAND] may be permitted to extend in the RECORD his remarks on the occasion of the laying of the cornerstone of the new physical education gymnasium building at Seton Hall College, South Orange, N. J., and to include therewith copies of several letters, including one from the Governor of the State of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Committee on Ways and Means, I offer a privileged resolution for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 307

Resolved, That ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committees of the House of Representatives on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, Claims, Revision of the Laws, and the Census.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 308

Resolved, That FADJO CRAVENS, of Arkansas, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committees of the House of Representatives on Territories, Mines and Mining, Claims, and Irrigation and Reclamation.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein an address by the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State of the United States and Chairman of the Governing Board of the Pan American Union, on the occasion of the celebration of Pan American Day at the New York World's Fair, Friday, September 22, 1939, on the subject of the Significance of the Pan American Movement in the Present Singularly Unhappy Junction of World Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an excerpt from MacMahon and Millett's Federal Administrators.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the remarks of Professor Hodges, Mr. Portnow, and myself on the subject of the European Crisis over radio station WEVD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] is absent. He recently delivered an interesting address at Corpus Christi, Tex., on the subject of neutrality. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein that address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement made by Mr. Jay C. Hormel on the subject of foreign relations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

NEUTRALITY

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of Neutrality and to include therein a brief excerpt from an editorial appearing in the Washington Herald day before yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, along with all Members of the Congress, as well as Americans generally, I deeply deplore the terrible conflagration that is raging in Europe at this time. It seems paradoxical that three of the greatest nations in the world—nations that have attained the very acme in refinement and culture—should now be in the ghastly grip of a bloody war seeking each other's annihilation.

The paramount desire and purpose of every patriotic American is to keep our peace-loving country out of that horrible holocaust of death and desolation.

Inasmuch as our Constitution vests in the Congress the power to declare war, naturally, being a Member of that body, I feel profoundly the weight of the obligation and responsibility which I owe my constituency and my country as a whole to use every effort in my power to help safeguard American neutrality to the end that the United States may not be drawn into the conflict.

The President has seen fit to call the Congress into extraordinary session to consider and devise the best means possible to safeguard our domestic security and tranquillity.

At the last session of the Congress the House passed a neutrality bill which prohibited the sale of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent nations. I voted for this measure, because at that time there was comparative peace in Europe and I felt that to return to international law might be construed as an affront by certain nations due to their geographical location. After all, however, the Lord created the lands and the seas, and we are, therefore, not responsible for the world's geography.

While the bill passed by the House placed an embargo on the sales of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent nations, it permitted the sales of foodstuffs and raw materials which could not only be sold, but shipped in

American bottoms, manned by American crews, and flying the American flag to belligerents irrespective of their nationality.

This bill is now before the Senate for its consideration.

It is proposed by one school of thought in the Senate to amend the House bill by lifting the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and provide that they may be sold to belligerents on condition that the purchaser come here and pay for the commodities and carry them away in their own ships and at their own risk. The other school of thought in the Senate opposes this principle, and insists on the maintenance of a strict embargo.

Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I have devoted long, careful, and conscientious study to the two theories, and at the moment, I feel that the cash-and-carry plan, if properly safeguarded and enforced, offers the best solution of our difficulty, provided the plan also embraces foodstuffs and raw materials as well as munitions of war.

It is conceded by Army experts and by laymen as well that food is not only the major but the indispensable necessity for carrying on a successful war. Napoleon said, "An army advances on its belly." And no matter, Mr. Speaker, how well an army may be equipped with arms and ammunitions, no matter how highly mechanized it may be, if it is not properly fed it is doomed to dismal failure. We appreciated this fact in 1918 when we inaugurated "wheatless and sweetless" days in order that our boys in Europe might have the required and necessary food supply.

Mr. Speaker, food being the primary and paramount necessity of war, for us to sell foodstuffs to belligerents and even deliver it, as can be done under existing law, and at the same time refuse to sell them materials of even less vitality, seems altogether inconsistent and absurd to me. Cotton, copper, zinc, brass, aluminum, and manganese are also essential to successful warfare, and yet under existing law we can sell these raw materials to belligerents and even deliver them, or attempt to do so, in our own craft.

The argument for not lifting the embargo on war munitions and returning to international law is that a cargo containing such contraband of a ship owned by American interests, manned by an American crew, and flying the American flag, might be sunk by one of the belligerent nations, and thus arouse such indignation in our country that we might be precipitated into war. How much more inflamed and indignant, I ask you, would the American people become should the cargo of such a ship be destroyed at sea consist of milk and flour and other food products to relieve starving babies, innocent children, and nonmilitant civilians of belligerent nations? The destruction of such a ship bearing cotton, copper, zinc, and so forth, would have the same effect on the psychology of the American people as if it contained guns, airplanes, and explosives.

Be it remembered, Mr. Speaker, that our entry into the last World War was due, in the main, to the ruthless and unrestricted submarine destruction of American merchant ships on the high seas. For us not to profit by that tragic example would be to classify us as the most stupid people on the face of the earth. Let us enact a neutrality law which will not only keep our merchant vessels outside the zone of hostilities, but our nationals as well. If American citizens are willing to assume the perils of war by traveling on foreign vessels, let them do so with the express understanding that they do so of their own volition and at their own risk.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the House an editorial which appeared in day before yesterday's issue of the Washington Herald, which is as follows:

In the 23 days since the war started 52 ships have been sunk. Britain has lost 32; Germany, 9; France, 1; and the neutral nations have lost 10. Four neutral ships have been destroyed in 3 days, and this has driven Sweden, one of the principal losers, to draft what the cables describe as a "stiff note" of protest to Germany.

Germany responds by pointing out that she is fighting for her life and has published a list of contraband which no ship, however neutral, may bring into the war zone. On this list she has put down cellulose and wood pulp, which the Swedish ships were carrying when torpedoed.

Wood pulp and cellulose are harmless as they stand. But they can be used in making high explosive.

Let this war continue to get more difficult and you will see the list of forbidden goods grow longer. Cotton, which can be doll dresses or dynamite; brass, which can be tubes or shell casings; wheat, which can feed civilians or soldiers; all these and the thousand other articles of innocent commerce will be marked down as contraband.

And just as surely the nations which carry suspect goods are going to get involved in the "freedom of the seas" argument, war's favorite tanglefoot.

Sweden may be able to work around this danger without war. We tried it once and lost. Better adopt a cash-and-carry system with all belligerents and let them fight it out between themselves as they haul their own cargoes in their own way.

To me this editorial accentuates the crux of the situation and I commend it to the careful consideration of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I assume that the American people have been pretty well "fed up" on statements over the radio and otherwise of high officials of the Government that they "hate war." This statement has been employed so often and with such studied repetition that it has become, in the language of Shakespeare, "dull, stale, and unprofitable." We are all unanimous in our abhorrence and execration of war, because we are familiar with the ashen fruits thereof. Let our high officials cease saying "we hope we can stay out of war" and "We believe we can stay out of war" and instead say unequivocally and with determination, "We will stay out of war!"

We know by experience what it means to engage in foreign war. We saw the young manhood of our Nation—the very flower of the Republic—rally to the colors and depart for Europe in 1918. Just 21 years ago, day before yesterday, our boys over there experienced their first zero hour when at 4 o'clock in the morning at the sound of the signal they went over the top and out into no-man's land to grapple with the foe they knew not of and with whom they had no quarrel, except one of pure fiction. From that fatal day forward, with just and increasing pride, we followed the news of their brilliant exploits of heroism on foreign soil. Inspired by the sincere conviction that they were engaged in a holy crusade to make, as we were told, "The world safe for democracy," in our imagination we were with them at Belleau Woods, at St. Mihiel, along the Marne, and in the bloody Argonne. With a gallantry and intrepidity which challenged the world's envy and admiration we saw them demolish the Hindenburg line which precipitated the collapse of German morale and immediately brought about the armistice.

And then, Mr. Speaker, we saw them return—that is, those that were not buried in foreign soil. They were not the same magnificent specimens of physical manhood that they were when they marched away. Alas, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of thousands of them returned mere shells and shadows of their former selves.

And what, I pray you, did we accomplish by that great sacrifice of blood and health and treasure? Today, as we review that awful experience in solemn reverie, we stand aghast, "sommnambulists of a vast shattered dream."

The pathetic scenes in our various veterans' hospitals and our rapidly increasing pension rolls, together with what is now going on in the world, amply attest the utter futility of that hapless venture.

Shall we repeat that terrible travesty—that ghastly tragedy again? Not by any vote of mine, Mr. Speaker. I pledge my constituency now that I shall never vote to send American troops to fight and die on foreign soil unless and until our country is first invaded by a foreign foe.

Mr. Speaker, during the next few months we shall witness a veritable avalanche of propaganda in this country designed to incite the passions and prejudices of our people in an effort to array them on one side or the other in this European conflict. Already this campaign of propaganda has manifested itself, and its repercussions are being registered and reflected in the increasing volume of mail of Members of both the House and the Senate. Much of this propaganda is downright insidious and mendacious, just as it was in 1918. Much of it emanates from subversive and un-American

activities in this country, such as the Communists and the German-American Bund, which, due to a friendly atmosphere in recent years, have become a real menace to our free institutions. It is the business of these insidious influences to breed war hysteria, and by villainous propaganda prey upon the sympathy and credulity of the people in order to confuse the merits of vital issues.

War propaganda has been reduced to an exact science by these foreign mountebanks, and it behooves the American people to be vigilantly on guard.

Personally I welcome advice from my constituency, but I sincerely hope they may not unconsciously become the purveyors of a false propaganda set in motion by influences in this country whose sole objective is the overthrow of this, the only true and free democratic government in the world today.

In conclusion I want to repeat that, in my judgment at this moment, the cash-and-carry plan is our surest guaranty against involvement in a foreign war, but this plan must embrace all commodities, raw materials as well as munitions of war. The law must be clean-cut and specific, admitting of no excuse for misconstruction, misunderstanding, or maladministration. Discretionary powers to an individual or board should be scrupulously avoided. It has been my observation in recent years that public officials too often interpret discretion for authority.

I am perfectly willing to go along with the present administration in any effort to keep this country out of war, but I shall vigorously oppose, by my voice and my vote, any effort from whatever source to enlist this country in another foreign military debacle.

In the midst of the perplexities and perils of this menacing world crisis, I am moved by only one motive and that is to help as best I can to keep our country out of war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein a statement by R. Armistead Grady, of Duluth, Minn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein excerpts from a letter of former Secretary of State Hon. William Jennings Bryan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

NEUTRALITY

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, today the entire world waits with varying emotions but with undivided interest for some sign which will indicate the policy which will be followed by America and by the American Government in our relations with the unfortunate nations of Europe that are now engaged in such a tragic and profitless struggle. The attitude of America, the policies of our Government, it is recognized, may materially affect the chances of the various combatants. No wonder, then, that the European nations and their nationals are vitally interested in the action of this session of the American Congress. Their interest is natural and understandable, but every American citizen should remember that in these trying days his first duty is to protect the peace of our own dear land—regardless of the effect of our policies on the quarrels of other nations.

The President has recognized this duty to our people—this solemn obligation to take any action reasonably calculated to keep the United States out of war. Acting on this recognition of our common duty, he convened the Congress in extraordinary session at noon last Thursday. This session

will consider the best possible methods of assuring the continuation of peace in our country. I know that each of us came to this session fully mindful of the great responsibility that rests on him as the duly accredited Representative of more than a quarter of a million people, and as one of the 531 men and women who must make the momentous decisions on which may rest the very perpetuity of civilization itself. I pray God that each one of us may have that illumination of mind and purity of spirit that we may each exercise that responsibility faithfully and intelligently.

In calling the Congress to consider a revision of our laws affecting our transactions with foreign nations, President Roosevelt has but carried out the American way of submitting such problems to the representatives of the people. Had he, as some have so unkindly and, I think, unwarrantedly suggested, desired to take the control of our foreign affairs into his own hands and to make his will, rather than the statutes enacted by Congress, the law of the land, he would not have called the Congress. On the contrary, he would have so conducted the affairs of our Nation that the results he desired would have been secured without any congressional action. That is the way things are done in most of the warring nations, but not in America.

The President has, however, often very clearly stated that he felt there should be a change in our existing neutrality laws, in order that we might minimize the dangers of America's entrance into the war. Maybe we can best understand the reasoning of those who want the law changed by first considering the provisions of the present law and then going back into the history of the last war a little.

Just what does the present neutrality law provide? I know that many of our citizens think that the present law would, in some unexplained way, keep America out of war, but I wonder just how many know just why they think it would have that effect. Many Americans doubtless look on the present law as a cloak of isolation for the United States, but on what facts do they rely for this feeling of security? I have received hundreds of printed appeals to "keep America out of war." Every patriotic American joins in that appeal. No decent citizen is going to knowingly plunge his country into war. It is entirely proper and desirable that our constituents should express their hope that we should keep America at peace. I want our people to feel that way. The disquieting feature of these prepared communications is, however, the implication contained in so many of them that our present laws are something sacred and that their repeal or modification will lead us toward war. In fact, many of these communications make the dogmatic statement that "the repeal of the present neutrality law would be equivalent to a declaration of war." At the same time, not one of all these communications makes any attempt to show wherein the present law has any tendency to keep America out of war, or how its modification or repeal would lead us any nearer to war. Surely, when considering such vital questions we should expect reasons and not depend simply on dogmatic statements of conclusions.

Let us, therefore, examine the present so-called neutrality law. What does it do? What does it fail to do? How does it either protect or involve America? In brief, the present neutrality law simply provides that, when a state of officially declared war exists between two or more nations of the world, it becomes the duty of the President to issue a proclamation of American neutrality. This he has, of course, done, insofar as France, England, and Germany are concerned, but not insofar as Russia and Japan are concerned, because their respective aggressions are not in the form of declared war. After this proclamation is issued it becomes unlawful for any American citizen to sell any arms, ammunition, or "implements of war" to any belligerent nation or citizen thereof, or to any neutral for reshipment to a belligerent. That is all there is to our much-discussed neutrality law.

What is the practical effect of this law? Well, for practical purposes it does not at this time mean but one thing—that is, England and France cannot get delivery on the airplanes they bought in this country last spring. Airplanes are included in the term "implements of war." I say that from a practical point of view the present law only affects airplane

shipments because they are the only things covered by the law which the belligerent nations want from the United States at this time. Certainly none of the warring nations need at this time to buy arms or ammunition in the United States. They all have supplies of arms ample to equip all the men they may be able to muster into service. No nation can afford to use a mixture of different types of arms if they can supply their troops with uniform equipment. To do so is to cause untold confusion in the matter of supplying ammunition. In other words, if a group of us go dove hunting and desire to use the same supply of shells, it will be much more convenient if we all use 12-gauge guns. At this time all of the major nations, except America, have a supply of ammunition as well as of guns, and surely Germany would never buy American ammunition. She does not need to. She has the two largest munition plants in the world. Her own Krupp plant has long been the world's greatest, and just last spring she acquired the great Skoda works when she took Czechoslovakia. Nor does Germany need American airplanes. She has never bought or sought to buy any quantity of airplanes here at any time. Presumably Germany has more airplanes than any other nation, with the possible exception of her ally, Soviet Russia, from whom she can buy without restriction. In short, Germany and Russia do not need the things that our present law embargoes. Germany would not buy these things from us if she were our next-door neighbor and could truck them across a line. She has these things. For years both Germany and Russia have invested their money and their resources in the construction of vast stores of war supplies. Time and again the United States has suggested that the nations of the world reduce their investments in military establishments, but never have we been able to stop the frenzied preparation for war that has carried the whole world with it. Today the nations that went farthest with this destructive preparation are ready to destroy the cities and civilians of their opponents, whereas, just to the extent that their opponents acted on our pleas that the nations refrain from overbuilding of great air bombers and other instruments of destruction, these opponents need to buy the things they did not build. Our present law rewards Germany for forcing the world into an armament race that has already cost our own Nation many billions of dollars, and that will cost us many more billions before we see the end. As I see it, the present law is not so neutral after all. Clearly it aids Germany and Russia and handicaps England and France.

In fact, throughout its short but inglorious history this so-called neutrality law has, without exception, served as an aid to the aggressor nations. The aggressor is always better prepared, better equipped than his victim, and in a better position to secure munitions, airplanes, and so forth. If he were not, he would not become an aggressor. Our present law has never and never can restrain an aggressor nation. It has, however, withheld from the weak, peace-loving nations all means of self-defense.

As I see it, our present law has not a chance to keep us out of war. The present law does nothing about keeping American citizens out of the zone of hostilities. It does nothing to keep American ships from carrying contraband cargo, except "arms, ammunition, and implements of war" to any port in the world. On the contrary, it definitely allows the delivery of oil, cotton, wheat, and iron to any nation by American citizens, on American ships, flying the American flag. These are the things that Germany, as well as England, wants to buy in the United States. These are the things both sides will try to get for themselves and will try to prevent reaching their enemies. Just as surely as we allow this traffic to continue in American ships, we are going to see American ships sunk. Under the protection of the present neutrality law, American oil companies are today loading their American-owned tankers at Houston and Port Arthur, in my own State, and can sail them, loaded with Texas gasoline, under the American flag, to all of the warring nations. We all know how vital oil and its products are to modern warfare. We know that, with all supplies of petroleum cut off, every plane would be grounded and every tank stalled. Germany is not going to

allow our oil to reach England if she can prevent it, and England is not going to allow it to reach Germany. Each side is going to stop any such ship, even though it does fly the Stars and Stripes, and if this trade continues in American ships, American ships are going to be sunk, and we are going to be led into war to protect the Standard Oil Co. If we are going to allow this traffic, we might just as well send the American fleet along with the oil tankers, because the tankers cannot carry on their business under the American flag in belligerent waters long without involving America and the American fleet.

Likewise, the present law places no obstacle in the path of those American citizens who want to travel in the war zone. As far as our present law is concerned, they can ride a British ship, loaded with high explosives, or they can travel through the front lines. Of course, to allow this will inevitably result in the loss of American lives, but our present law does not prevent it. Neither does the present neutrality law prevent the sale of goods on a credit. The citizens of any nation can, so far as our neutrality laws are concerned, come here, and if they can find anyone who will sell them oil, iron, or cotton, on a credit, they can buy it and take it or send it on an American ship to any belligerent port.

Nor is the present law defective simply in a negative way. It stands as a positive and active threat to American prosperity and security. From the standpoint of our own self-interest, the retention of the present embargo provisions of our law must have three well-defined and injurious consequences:

First. The immediate effect will be the removal of industry from the United States to Canada. Nor does this removal, as some people think, primarily involve the profits of the owners of the industries. The same concerns will continue to own the plants. The same men will make the profits. Only the working personnel will be vitally concerned. The workmen will be Canadians rather than Americans. Now, I would not suggest for one minute that we should consider any policy that would jeopardize American peace, even in order to put American citizens to work, but if a continuation of our present policy definitely jeopardizes the safety of our own country, as I believe it does, then the fact that that same policy also moves jobs across the international line certainly cannot be looked upon as recommending the continuation of the policy.

Second. A continuation of our present law means an abandonment of our historic policy of opposition to excessive armaments. If the smaller nations of the world that do not have munition plants and airplane factories of their own are to be denied the right to buy these things in the American market when they are attacked by those who have these supplies, then their only possible course is to join in the ruinous rivalry of building their own armaments to the breaking point during times of peace. Our present law blots out all that America has done in behalf of the cause of international disarmament and sets the world back a generation.

Third. But far more important from our standpoint, the retention of the present embargo means that the United States can never hope to build up those industries so essential to our own defense in case we should be attacked. Our airplane factories will, of course, produce only as many planes as they can sell; and when their market is cut off, these factories will cease to develop. Under the present law, with no European markets, American factories must close. Should we then be attacked, we would have neither the plants nor the trained personnel for the construction of the planes that the United States would need. I believe that the defense of America is vital. I do not believe that we can wait until we are involved in war to attempt to establish those vital industries. Neither can we afford to rely upon the expensive and ineffective method of building up great peacetime armaments, which will rapidly become obsolete, and which, in the absence of producing factories, cannot be replaced. I think our foreign policy should be realistic and should have as its first, last, and ever-present objective the protection of America and the maintenance of American peace.

What, my friends, took us into the last World War? Certainly we wanted to stay out then just as sincerely as we do now. Less than 6 months before we entered that war the public had expressed its determination to stay out of war, and had elected a President and a Congress largely on that issue. However, when war came it came in response to the demand of the American people. What had caused the change in American opinion? As I see it, two things had conspired to bring the American people to a willingness to fight. These two things were: (1) The sale of goods to belligerent nations on credit; and (2) the insistence of American citizens on their privilege to travel in the war zone. Over a period of years American banking houses had been financing the purchase of goods by the Allies. These bankers had come to the conclusion that if they were to collect their notes an Allied victory was necessary, and that it would be necessary for the United States to join in the war if such a victory was to be assured. The next step was for those who had a financial interest in the outcome of the war to find some more appealing excuse to offer to the people. With the sinking of the British ship *Lusitania* by a German submarine with the loss of more than 100 American lives came the incident. Those whose money was involved saw to it that the indignation of the American public was aroused and we went to war "to make the world safe for democracy." Well, democracy still seems to be on mighty thin ice, but the American banking houses collected for all the credit business that had been done with the Allies. Of course, we know that the Government of the United States finally put up the money and that the ordinary people of America did all the dying and are still doing the paying for that war, but we did get a fine crop of millionaires.

But so much for 1917. What will take us into war in 1939? Just the same factors will take us down that bloody road today if we allow these same factors free play. Credit to warring nations always creates a financial interest in the outcome of some foreign fight. The sale of goods of any kind on a credit to any belligerent should be stopped, and if it is not stopped, it will lead us to war just as it did in 1917. But the present law allows such credit sales.

The travel of American citizens in the war zone is certain, sooner or later, to involve our country if we continue to permit it. If Americans continue to ride British ships or the ships of any other belligerent, it is sure that some of them will ultimately lose their lives, and when that happens it is going to be very doubtful whether we can maintain American neutrality. We did not do it in 1917. But the present law on which some of our citizens rely for American security allows a repetition of the same errors we made then.

Nor is that all. The most immediate threat to our neutrality lies in the movement of goods into the war zone on American ships. And the present law does absolutely nothing to prevent this. I have already mentioned petroleum and its products as being of vital importance in any modern war. If there was nothing else to involve us in war, I cannot believe that we will be able to continue shipping American oil in American ships, with American crews under the American flag, into the war zone without involving our country in this war before Christmas. I know, of course, that Americans and American ships have a theoretical right anywhere on the high seas. I likewise know that I have a right to drive along that street out there whenever I want, but if the sheriff was shooting across the street at a gang of bandits and the outlaws were shooting back, I think I should be "bored for the simples" if I should insist on my right to drive down the street. That is the situation as regards American ships taking goods to any of the warring nations today, except that those who send American ships to these nations, and even those American citizens who insist on traveling in the war zone, endanger not only themselves but they are endangering the whole Nation. They know that if they are killed or their property is destroyed they have thereby made the entrance of our Nation into war that much more probable. Yet just as long as they think they can make a dollar there will be people who will risk their lives and endanger their countrymen. It is all very well to say "let them do it at their own risk." I would go

just as far as President Roosevelt has proposed in this regard, and even further. I would keep all American citizens, all American ships, and all American credit out of the war zone. I am afraid there is no such thing as travel at one's "own risk." The fact is, and we all know it, that after an American ship is sunk, or the American flag is shot down passions are aroused that make it impossible for the Government to consider the question of who assumed the risk, or to ignore the incident. The only way to avoid this source of war is to keep American citizens and ships out of the war zone. Yet the present law does nothing to prevent this. Do you think that kind of a law is going to keep America out of war? I do not. The bad dog bites the delivery boy, not the grocer who sold the goods and filled the order in his store. We must stop being delivery boys to those folks who are at war. Let us make those fellows buy their goods on the Piggly Wiggly plan.

The way to prevent a repetition of the horrors of the last war so far as America is concerned is to profit by the experience of the past. Let us stop the sale of goods to warring nations on credit. Let us stop American citizens from traveling in the war zone. Let us keep American ships out of the combat area. Are these three objectives unfair, un-American, or unneutral? Is there anything so sinister about these simple proposals? I think not. On the contrary, I think they are good, common sense. They are the principles of the proposed cash-and-carry neutrality bill. Early last spring the President suggested to Congress that we should revise and strengthen the American neutrality law. He suggested that the changes should be made before war broke out in Europe. Unfortunately the discussion in Congress dragged on and on. Finally this House passed a half-hearted neutrality bill, but the other body—the Senate—never even offered to consider the question. We are therefore squarely faced with the problem today, and we realize that now the necessity for speedy action is very pressing. We cannot afford to delay. Delay may well involve America unnecessarily. I feel very deeply that President Roosevelt is right; that this program is fair to all nations; that on it depends the safety of America. I pray God that we may be able to remove these visible dangers before they lead us into the tragedy of war.

This program continues the rules of international law, which has always recognized the right of any people to sell anything to any other people. It allows our people to continue to do business with the nations of the world without involving them in the hazards of submarine warfare. It allows American fields and American factories to continue to produce for export as they have always done. The American farmer and the American laborer did not cause the present conditions in Europe. Are they to be denied the opportunity to sell the products of their toil to people who want to buy them just because some foreign nation wants to starve its enemy? If such sale of American goods seemed to endanger the peace of America, the answer might be "yes." I am willing—and I am sure that you are willing—to go to great lengths to keep America out of war; but let me again repeat—it is the delivery, not the sale, of goods that leads to war. If, then, the only effect of an embargo on American goods is to help one or more of the European countries, I am against such an embargo. I am willing to impose most burdensome restrictions on any and all of our people to maintain our peace, but I am not willing to ask our American people to close half their factories and let half the farm land of the South grow up to Johnson grass simply to please some European rulers. Let Americans work. Let our farms and our factories continue to produce. Let us sell to all the world at our own ports. All of this is purely a domestic matter and will not involve us in any trouble. But let us see that in our desire to keep our people working we do not inject ourselves, our people, or our ships into the war zone.

It is, of course, true that the practical effect of such a policy is to allow those nations who have the ships to buy more of our goods than the nations who have invested their resources in bombing planes and implements of invasions. But, here again, I repeat, our action should be determined by self-interest, not sentiment. Our own Nation has al-

ways invested heavily in a great Navy. On that Navy we depend for our rubber, our tin, our coffee, our sugar, and a long list of articles of everyday life, as well as indispensable war materials. Certainly, were we suddenly forced to defend our own shores, we would need to buy large quantities of the very munitions and airplanes which we now refuse to sell. We have relied on other nations to continue to follow the well-established rules of international law. We expect these other nations to sell us anything we can pay for if we will go get it any time we need it. If we change the rule, I fear, my friends, that the time will surely come, and possibly shortly, when that very change will rise up to smite us. For, surely if it is wrong for America to sell to those who can come and pay for our products, it will likewise be wrong for other nations to sell to us when we find ourselves in need, and let no one delude you, the United States does need and will need foreign goods for years to come. If warring nations are to be no longer free to buy from all neutrals, then all nations, America included, must arm to the hilt. We must then follow the horrible example of some of the European nations. We must supply ourselves with every necessity and we must continually replenish our supply. We must convert the Ford plant into a second Krupp works. This is exactly what our Nation has sought to avoid for years. We have professed to want to see all nations disarm. Let us not now be the Nation to change the rules so as to force the very thing that we have so long opposed. Let not America be guilty of contributing to a new era of overarmament.

Nor does a policy such as I have described mean that American shipping must quit the seas. It simply means that American ships must quit carrying goods to belligerent nations. South America is at peace with us, and at peace with the rest of the world. South America should be tied more closely to our country, but for years British and German vessels have carried much of the commerce to and from the nations of that continent. Today the German ships are off the seas. If we force Britain to come after everything they want in the United States, it will force British ships out of the South American runs into the North Atlantic runs. Naturally, American ships will replace them. American ships out of the war zone into the South American trade. British ships out of the South American trade into the war zone. As I see it, a decided gain for America. And, after all is said and done, that is just what I want—a policy that will protect American interests, a policy that will keep America at peace—in short, an American policy.

My friends, I hope that I may not be considered as selfish or unfeeling. I hope that I may not be without the deepest sympathy for the suffering of my fellow men in Europe. I hope I may not judge my European friends unfairly. I know that we would all be happy to save Europe. But Europe cannot be saved if we destroy America. If we are to save civilization, if we are to save the world, we must save America. The world cannot afford to lose the example and influence of a free America, a democratic America, an America dedicated in the future as in the past to peace with all nations, to liberty for all within her boundaries. No; America has no right to gamble with the future of civilization, and that is what she would be doing were she to involve herself in the quarrels of Europe. Neither has any American citizen a right to gamble with the destiny of America, and that is just what he does when he goes into the combat zone for any purpose.

Since there are Americans who are so unmindful of their Nation's welfare, it becomes the duty of our Government to throw away the broken reed of existing law on which we have leaned and to implement our Nation with a real neutrality law on which we can safely rest. Of course, I know that we can no more guarantee peace by law than we can guarantee that there will be no more crime; but just as we know that laws check crime, so we can and should check our headlong course toward war. Let us do all we can. Let us stop credit sales to belligerents. Let us forbid American citizens and American ships from going into the combat zone. Let us tell all the world that we will sell to all who come, but that they must pay cash and take their goods home. Let

us do these things that we can see to do and pray to God that He may do for us those things that we cannot see to do.

I sincerely hope that we may be able, without undue delay, to pass legislation that will remove these dangers against which our present law gives us no defense. I can see no reason why the United States should become involved in war if such a realistic policy is pursued. Of course, I recognize the ever-present influence of propaganda which all of the belligerents are pouring out to the American people. Our people are very gullible, and their emotions are easily aroused. They are very prone to rely altogether too strongly on dogmatic statements and attractive phrases. I hope every American will, in the days to come, demand reasons for all statements made about our foreign policy, or that of other nations. Our people must keep their feet on the ground. In this same connection we may expect many efforts to excite our sympathy by stories of the brutality of certain of the belligerents. Let us be careful in our evaluation of these stories, for they are calculated to arouse our passions and lead us to war. In the long run, this is probably the most dangerous single factor in the present situation for America. War is never humane, but as it goes on nations resort to more and more horrible methods, and all too soon the stories that are now but unscrupulous propaganda may become actual facts. Then, indeed, will the soul of America be tortured.

In this tragic hour I feel a deep sense of responsibility that is almost a depression. It is an awful thing to have to make a decision that may involve the lives of millions and the welfare of the whole world. I hope that the good people of America will pray for me, for each of my colleagues, and for America, while we press forward doing the right as God gives us the power to see the right.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* and to include therein an address delivered by me at a session of the Inter-parliamentary Union held in Oslo, Norway, in August 1939.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I submit the further request to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* and to include therein a copy of a letter sent by me to the Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER, of the United States Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the *RECORD* an address delivered by me at Wake Forest College at the beginning of the one hundred and sixth session of that institution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* by including therein an article written by David Lawrence in yesterday's *Washington Evening Star*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* and to quote briefly from the President's message, as well as a letter written by the Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* and to include therein an editorial from the *Aberdeen Daily World*, of Aberdeen, Wash.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* on the New Deal credit-and-carry war-promotion bill and to include therein some brief extracts from speeches delivered by Hon. Sumner Welles, Assistant Secretary of State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* and to include therein a radio speech delivered by me and also a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have permission to address the House for 20 minutes next Monday after the reading of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* by inserting therein a speech delivered by me over the National Broadcasting System on the 12th instant.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* by including therein a letter appearing in the *New York Times* on the question of embargoes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CROP CONDITIONS IN NORTH MISSISSIPPI AND NORTHWESTERN ALABAMA

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this session of Congress was called for the purpose of considering the question of neutrality, and we have been asked to postpone the consideration of other legislation until that question is disposed of. However, the people I represent are confronted with a condition that is just as serious to them as a war. I understand the same conditions or similar conditions prevail in several other areas throughout the United States. We have the worst crop conditions that northeastern Mississippi and northwestern Alabama have seen in a hundred years, due to the continuous rains and overflows that began early in the spring and continued until August.

Then followed a serious drought, which prevented even the planting and raising of feed crops. It is even worse than the loss of the crop itself, because the farmers had not only gone to the expense of preparing their ground and buying fertilizer and seed, but they planted their crops several times, and each time they were destroyed by rains and floods to such an extent that the whole section has been declared an emergency area by the Department of Agriculture. But the Department of Agriculture is short of funds to meet the situation. What good does it do to tell people they are in an emergency, that they have suffered a disaster, unless we can do something about it?

This emergency area covers 21 counties in northern Mississippi, including the First District which I represent, the Second District represented by Mr. Doxey, and the Fourth District represented by Mr. Ford of Mississippi. These two gentlemen and I have done everything we possibly could to get help for these farmers. But it seems to me that under the circumstances we are going to have this emergency legislation.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I will yield for a question.

Mr. PITTENGER. Does the gentleman know of any reason why we should not take up other legislative matters in addition to neutrality and the embargo provisions?

Mr. RANKIN. I was about to say that in disasters of this kind it seems to me that while we are waiting on the Senate to debate the neutrality bill, which passed the House some months ago, we might take up these emergency measures and pass them without interfering with the consideration of neutrality legislation.

These matters cannot wait. My desk is piled with letters from farmers telling me that they are selling their cattle, their hogs, and their chickens in order to get money with which to meet their current living expenses in a country that has some of the richest land in the Nation. It is an emergency that must be met, and for that reason I have introduced a joint resolution providing for an emergency appropriation to be administered by the Department of Agriculture.

I do not want to disrupt the program or interfere with the discussion of neutrality legislation. As I said, this is a matter confronting the people of that section which is just as serious to them as if they were in a war. In fact, it is a war for their very existence. It is true that it is temporary. In another year they will be on their feet, but they must have assistance to take them through the winter months, and I think it would be nothing short of criminal to wait until they have lost their livestock and seen what little they have left taken from them because of a condition over which they have no control.

These are people who do not beg to get on relief. These are people who have not asked the Government to support them. These are people who have supported the Government in times of peace and fought its battles in times of war. They are now in distress and are entitled to this consideration. I shall insist that this joint resolution be taken up right away and passed for their benefit. [Applause.]

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a copy of the joint resolution which I have just introduced.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. The joint resolution is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 386

Joint resolution making an appropriation for loans and relief in flood-stricken areas of Mississippi and Alabama

Resolved, etc., That to continue to provide loans, grants, and relief for distressed farmers, so as to meet emergency needs in those portions of northeastern Mississippi and northwestern Alabama which have been or may hereafter be declared emergency areas by the Secretary of Agriculture as a result of recent destructive rains and floods, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$20,000,000, which amount shall be added to the appropriation made in section 3 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to add my word of agreement to that of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. It happens that some of these counties that were particularly hard hit lie in my district. I have had letters during the last few days from the county agents and from others who are acquainted with the facts, who tell me that the crop conditions are absolutely deplorable, and that the resulting conditions among the people of those counties are distressing. The cotton crop is probably 25 to 30 percent of normal, and corn will do well to measure up to that. I remember one county agent estimated that in his county there would be produced 350,000 bushels of corn, whereas the normal crop is a million and a half. The same is largely true of other crops, except hay. These are farmers, as the gentleman from Mississippi has said, who have not been on relief and have not sought it, but now they are confronted with a condition that is indeed deplorable and distressing.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Speaker BANKHEAD, who has been called home, informed me that a large number of the counties in his district are in the same condition.

I have never seen such conditions. One man wrote me the other day that where they made 3,000 bales of cotton in his community they would only make 300 bales this year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me add one more word, if I may, at this time. I was going to say that the same conditions prevailed in a great part of Speaker BANKHEAD's district, and also in Mr. JARMAN's district. In fact, it is so bad in Mr. JARMAN's district that he has not been able to come here for this special session. He is detained there trying to work out some plan.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I would like to ask the gentleman to include also all of south Georgia and north Florida, and the greater portion of South Carolina.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, I am not so familiar with that.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I might call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in many of the drought-stricken States we have had a series of at least 6 years of such disasters. In my own State of Nebraska this year we will have approximately a 30-percent corn crop.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure that these conditions do prevail elsewhere.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

URGENT LEGISLATION

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of attention and a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentlemen who have just addressed the House. I want to join with them in registering a protest against the policy, which I understand has been adopted, of limiting the measures to be considered at this session to neutrality, embargo, and other measures of like character. Not only in the sections of the country that have been mentioned here but all over the country there are problems which demand the attention of the Congress. For example, there is the Harrison-Colmer bill, which has for its purpose to provide that the Federal Government shall contribute to the expenses of local governments where land is taken for forestry purposes and is taken off the tax rolls.

Then, as was pointed out the other day, the Relief Act of 1940 should be amended so that Work Projects administrators can have more discretion and more authority in the handling of cases of relief. The law which was passed should be amended along those lines.

In my opinion, while Congress is in session we ought to consider the uncompleted business that was before us on the 5th day of August 1939, when we adjourned. I therefore hope there will be a change in the attitude with reference to the different measures that are of concern to this country, which should have consideration at this time. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a letter from Mr. Otis N. Brown, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and a copy of Resolution No. 243, adopted by the Fortieth National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 2, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1092. A letter from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a report on companies sponsoring installment-investment plans, which supplements the Commission's over-all report on its study of investment trusts and investment companies made pursuant to section 30 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 (H. Doc. No. 482); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1093. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report and recommendation to the Congress concerning the claim of Robert E. Newton against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

1094. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to facilitate and simplify national forest administration; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1095. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report of the Archivist of the United States on lists of papers consisting of 200 items, from those submitted for disposition by the Department of the Treasury to the Congress of the United States, January 4, 1935, referred to the Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, and by that committee referred to the Archivist for examination and a report thereon, and from those recommended to him for disposition, December 4, 1936, and May 1, 1939, by the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1096. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report of the Archivist of the United States on lists of papers, consisting of 6,578 items, recommended by him for disposition, April 11, 1939, and April 20, 1939, by the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1097. A letter from the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with official State agencies, to prevent the dissemination of pullorum and other diseases of poultry, and to improve poultry products, and hatcheries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1098. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report of the Archivist of the United States on lists of papers, consisting of 127 items, recommended to him for disposition on April 20, May 11, May 26, June 19, and June 22, 1939, by the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1099. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers, consisting of one item, from those recommended for disposition, July 5, 1939, by the United States Civil Service Commission; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1100. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers, consisting of 125 items, among the archives and records of the Federal Communications

Commission, which the Commission has recommended should be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1101. A letter from the secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of loans and other authorizations made during the month of August 1939 (H. Doc. No. 483); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

1102. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report and recommendation to the Congress concerning the claim of O'Brien Bros., Inc., New York City, N. Y., against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 7549. A bill providing for an examination and survey at Belle Glade, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 7550. A bill authorizing the construction of a new veterans' hospital and diagnostic center in the First Congressional District of the State of South Dakota, to be known as the Royal C. Johnson Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona:

H. R. 7551. A bill authorizing payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians for the lands ceded by them in the agreement of February 25, 1896, ratified by the act of June 10, 1896, and reopening such lands to mineral entry; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Ohio:

H. J. Res. 385. Joint resolution establishing a Greenville Memorial Commission to formulate plans for the construction of a memorial building to commemorate the treaty of Greene Ville at Greenville, Ohio; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. J. Res. 386. Joint resolution making an appropriation for loans and relief in flood-stricken areas of Mississippi and Alabama; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 309. Resolution authorizing the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to obtain various information in regard to the preparedness of the United States for its national defense; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 7552. A bill for the relief of Rachib Shriay; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAWKS:

H. R. 7553. A bill to admit George Matthew Schucktanzen permanently to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona:

H. R. 7554. A bill for the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 7555. A bill granting an increase of pension to Winnie Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5518. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of 40 members of the Waynedale Methodist Church, Waynedale, Ind., urging Congress to retain the embargo on arms and munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5519. Also, petition of Forest E. Drake and sundry citizens of Indiana objecting to proposed repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5520. Also, petition of 75 voters of Wolcottville and South Bend, Ind., opposing any change in the present Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5521. Also, petition of James B. Smith and sundry residents of Fort Wayne and New Haven, Ind., urging that the arms embargo be retained; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5522. Also, petition of E. C. Geeding and 50 other citizens of Bluffton, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5523. Also, petition of Chester L. Piper and sundry residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., expressing opposition to the proposed repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5524. Also, petition of Helen J. Thiel and sundry residents of Butler, Ind., protesting against proposed repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5525. Also, petition of Robert Hattersley and sundry citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing any change in the present Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5526. Also, petition of 110 employees of the Auburn Foundry, Inc., Auburn, Ind., opposing any amendments to the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5527. Also, petition of Blanche Schoenle and 50 other residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., urging repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5528. Also, petition of U. J. Loos and sundry residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing any changes in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5529. Also, petition of Margret Hagerty and sundry residents of Hamilton, Ind., opposing any changes in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5530. Also, petition of Sarah Shroyer and 25 residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., objecting to any change in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5531. Also, petition of Edwin Sohn and 87 other students of Concordia College, Fort Wayne, Ind., objecting to the proposed revision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5532. Also, petition of Margaret Rohrer and sundry citizens of Berne, Ind., objecting to the proposed repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5533. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph C. Hayes and sundry citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., advocating retention of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5534. Also, petition of Mrs. Jesse Herrmann and sundry residents of Keystone, Bluffton, and Petroleum, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5535. Also, petition of Bernadine F. Froendly and sundry citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5536. Also, petition of Lillian Bowman, Elaine Thompson, and other employees of the Lincoln National Life Insurance Co., Fort Wayne, Ind., petitioning Congress not to repeal the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5537. Also, petition of Lucy Bolyard and sundry citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing any change in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5538. Also, petition of W. T. Arnold and 100 citizens of Garrett, Ind., opposing proposed repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5539. Also, petition of Mrs. W. A. Etoll and sundry citizens of Garrett, Ind., appealing for strict neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5540. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Sam Williams and sundry residents of Keystone, Bluffton, Poneto, and Petroleum, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5541. Also, petition of Rev. E. O. Kegerreis, pastor of the Hudson Methodist Church, and 50 residents of Hudson, Ashley, and Pleasant Lake, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5542. Also, petition of Rev. Russell Weller and 90 members of the Pleasant Dale Church of the Brethren, Decatur,

Ind., urging Congress to retain the embargo on arms and munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5543. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Elmer J. Auspaugh and 25 members of the Evangelical Church of Decatur, Ind., petitioning Congress not to repeal the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5544. Also, petition of Rev. Edgar L. Johnston and 90 other members of the Kimmell, Ind., Methodist Church, opposing repeal of the arms embargo provision of the present Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5545. Also, petition of Edmund G. Dikty and sundry citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing American participation in the European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5546. Also, petition of Esther Bowers and 50 other residents of Decatur, Ind., protesting against the proposed repeal of the arms-embargo provision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5547. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. J. B. Hay and 35 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5548. Also, petition of Rev. Richard A. Most, of Fort Wayne, and 50 members of his congregation, opposing any change in the present Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5549. Also, petition of Rev. Donald H. Ray and 25 residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., urging that the Neutrality Act not be repealed; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5550. Also, petition of Daniel P. White and 30 residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., requesting that no changes be made in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5551. Also, petition of Emil Zimmerman and 25 residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., urging Congress to keep the embargo on arms and munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5552. Also, petition of Walter L. Peterson and 20 other employees of the Honolulu Conservatory of Music, Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing the proposed lifting of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5553. Also, petition of Emory Stetler and sundry residents of Syracuse, Ind., urging Congress to retain the present embargo on arms and munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5554. Also, petition of John C. Kreider and 50 other residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., urging Congress not to repeal the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5555. Also, petition of Don Murray and 40 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing revision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5556. Also, petition of Rev. Vernon L. Riley and 60 members of the Monroe Friends Church, Monroe, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5557. Also, petition of Rev. Van B. Wright and 50 members of the Church of the Brethren, Fort Wayne, Ind., urging retention of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5558. Also, petition of Mrs. Martin Hockemeyer and 75 other residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5559. Also, petition of Clara Young and 75 other residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., petitioning Congress not to change the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5560. Also, petition of J. C. Kohr and 40 other residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5561. Also, petition of Isabel A. Smith and 30 other voters of Fort Wayne, Ind., objecting to any change in the present Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5562. Also, petition of Howard and George Mountz and 150 citizens of Garrett, Ind., opposing the repeal of the present Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5563. Also, petition of Rev. E. B. Fletcher and 30 residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., objecting to proposed repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5564. Also, petition of Dorothy Ake and 60 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing any change in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5565. Also, petition of Dwight M. Myers and 67 citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing the repeal of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5566. Also, petition of Rev. Donald J. Dunkin and 60 residents of Garrett, Ind., requesting Congress not to repeal the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5567. Also, petition of Sylvester Pierr and 70 citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing sale of arms and munitions to nations at war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5568. Also, petition of Rev. Walter Klausing and 100 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing the proposed repeal of the embargo provision of the present Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5569. Also, petition of Josephine Strang and sundry citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5570. Also, petition of Edward R. Rossman and sundry citizens of Decatur, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5571. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Lumm and sundry citizens of the Fourth Indiana District, opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5572. Also, petition of 110 members, employees, and friends of the Young Men's Christian Association, Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing the repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5573. Also, petition of P. F. Buuck and 90 other residents of New Haven, Ind., petitioning Congress not to amend the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5574. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of sundry citizens of Medaryville, Ind., and vicinity, opposing the repeal of or any change in the present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5575. Also, petition of members of the Methodist Episcopal Churches of the Bourbon circuit, Indiana, opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5576. Also, petition of members of the Church of the Brethren of Plymouth, Ind., protesting against the repeal of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5577. Also, petition of members of the Upper Deer Creek Church of the Brethren, Walton, Ind., opposing the proposed change in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5578. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of Mrs. J. E. Walters and other residents of Warren, Pa., opposing changes in Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5579. Also, petition of Mrs. W. M. Stevenson, of North Warren, and other citizens of Warren County, Pa., opposing changes in Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5580. Also, petition of Mrs. N. W. Hess and other residents of Sharon, Pa., opposing changes to Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5581. Also, petition of May Ridgway and other residents of Oil City, protesting against war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5582. Also, petition of Amelia Bauer and other citizens of Warren, Pa., opposing change in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5583. Also, petition of R. F. Buzzard and other residents of Climax, Pa., opposing changes in neutrality legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5584. Also, petition of Harold Reed Weaver and other residents of Warren, Pa., opposing changes in neutrality legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5585. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. B. A. Vollmer, Mr. and Mrs. George Cuneo, and other residents of Elk County, Pa., opposing changes in neutrality legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5586. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Glenn G. Grosch and other residents of Warren County, Pa., opposing changes in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5587. Also, petition of J. Albert Johnson, Mr. and Mrs. Richard N. Mack, and other citizens of Sugar Grove, Pa.,

opposing changes in neutrality legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5588. By Mr. KINZER: Petition of 62 members of St. Peter's Reformed Church of Lancaster, Pa., urging that the United States of America do not become involved in the current European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5589. Also, petition of 71 citizens of Marietta, Pa., urging that the United States of America do not become involved in the current European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5590. Also, petition of 80 members of St. Mary's Church Mother's Club, of Lancaster, Pa., urging that the United States of America do not become involved in the current European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5591. Also, petition of the clergy of Marietta, Pa., urging that the United States of America do not become involved in the current European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5592. Also, petition of 86 citizens of Lancaster, Pa., urging that the United States of America do not become involved in the current European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5593. Also, petition of 70 members of St. Mary's Parish, Marietta, Pa., urging that the United States of America do not become involved in the current European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5594. By Mr. O'TOOLE: Petition of Louis Marotta and 126 other residents of the Eighth Congressional District of New York, opposing any revision of the present Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5595. Also, petition containing 44 signatures from Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing repeal of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5596. Also, petition of Christopher Doyle, Jr., and 37 other residents of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the incorporation of the cash-and-carry clause in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5597. Also, petition of D. J. Breslin and other residents of the Bay Ridge area in Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the lifting of the present embargo on the export of arms and munitions to warring nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5598. By Mr. POLK: Petition of J. T. Olson, and others, of Portsmouth, Ohio, urging Congress to adopt the so-called cash-and-carry plan to govern our foreign trade; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5599. Also, petition of Edith Anstaett, of Batavia, and 14 other citizens of Clermont County, Ohio, asking that Congress make no change in the present neutrality law that would in any possible way involve us in war on foreign soil; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5600. Also, petition of Mildred Haigh, secretary, Farm Bureau Advisory Council, New Market Township, Highland County, Ohio, and 20 other members, asking Congress to preserve the peace of our country that we may not be oppressed by entering another European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5601. Also, petition of G. L. Wamsley and 10 other citizens of West Union, Ohio, opposing any change in the present neutrality law, particularly the proposed cash-and-carry plan, which they believe, if adopted, would eventually lead to war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5602. Also, petition of Catherine Bezler, of Amelia, and 59 other citizens of Clermont County, Ohio, asking that the Congress do not repeal the Embargo Act, keep strictly neutral, no foreign entanglements, and keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5603. Also, petition of L. C. Hoss, of Sugartree Ridge, and 43 other citizens of Concord Township, Highland County, Ohio, urging the preserving of the neutrality law in such form as to prevent being forced into the European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5604. Also, petition of George W. Johnson and other citizens of Batavia, Clermont County, Ohio, urging the preservation of the present Neutrality Act and particularly opposing

the lifting of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5605. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Donato Dittarelli and 110 citizens of Follansbee, W. Va., urging that we keep arms embargo, oppose cash and carry, and keep out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5606. Also, petition of George B. Potts and 44 citizens of Paden City, Wetzel County, W. Va., urging that we adhere to strict neutrality and vote against any proposed change in our present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5607. Also, petition of Verne Monroe, chairman, committee of the Cameron First Methodist Church, Cameron, W. Va., a congregational unit of over 500 members, opposing any change in the present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5608. Also, petition of George B. Potts and other citizens of Paden City, Wetzel County, W. Va., urging that we adhere to strict neutrality and vote against any proposed change in our present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5609. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the District of Columbia Cooperative League, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 2605, known as the Norris bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5610. Also, petition of the International Association for Identification, Albany, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the subjects of parole and probation, also the subject of fingerprint; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5611. Also, petition of the Defenders of America, Pittsburgh Chapter 1, Moose Temple, Pittsburgh, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to all foreign "isms"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1939

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Giver of Wisdom, in whose light we see light: Forgive us, we beseech Thee, that so often we fail to ask that which is right. Recall us to goodness, and strengthen our wills, that by Thy grace we may overcome the manifold temptations that continually beset us. Illumine our thoughts by Thy divine wisdom, that we may discover in our sense of duty the vision of better lives for each one of us and a happier human fellowship for all mankind. Though the present is overcast and heavy with gloom, while some live upon the light that was and others wait for the light that is to be, do Thou grant to us now a fresh apocalypse of God, a divine sunrise in our humanity that shall light our way onward and upward to the hills of peace.

"Peace does not mean the end of all our striving,

Joy does not mean the drying of our tears,

Peace is the Power that comes to souls arriving

Up to the light where God Himself appears."

Harken, we beseech Thee, to this our prayer for our dear Redeemer's sake. Amen.

APPEARANCE OF SENATORS

WILLIAM H. KING, a Senator from the State of Utah; RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Jr., a Senator from the State of Georgia; and TOM STEWART, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, appeared in their seats today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 28, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Downey	Logan	Russell
Andrews	Ellender	Lucas	Schwartz
Austin	Frazier	Lundeen	Schwellenbach
Bailey	George	McCarran	Sheppard
Barbour	Gerry	McKellar	Shipstead
Barkley	Gibson	McNary	Slattery
Bilbo	Gillette	Maloney	Smathers
Borah	Green	Mead	Stewart
Bulow	Guffey	Miller	Taft
Burke	Gurney	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Hale	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	Hatch	Neely	Tobey
Capper	Hayden	Norris	Townsend
Caraway	Herring	Nye	Truman
Chavez	Holman	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Overton	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	Van Nuys
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Pittman	Wagner
Danaher	King	Radcliffe	White
Davis	La Follette	Reed	Wiley
Donahey	Lee	Reynolds	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senators from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. HILL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are unavoidably detained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

CLAIM OF O'BRIEN BROS., INC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation concerning the claim of O'Brien Bros., Inc., New York City, N. Y., against the United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

Joint resolution authorizing the board of control to negotiate with the Federal Government for the transfer of the former Indian school at Tomah

Whereas the Federal Government has abandoned the use of the former Indian school at Tomah, Wis., due to a change in policy as to nonsegregation of Indian students; and

Whereas it was proposed by the Federal Government to raze such buildings, but such demolition was postponed upon request of the Governor, in order to determine whether or not the State could utilize the same; and

Whereas this legislature has heretofore adopted joint resolution No. 132A, memorializing the Congress of the United States to convey all of such property located at Tomah to the State of Wisconsin rather than permit such property to waste and deteriorate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the board of control or its successor be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed to negotiate with the Department of Interior or other proper authorities for the transfer and conveyance to the State of Wisconsin of the Federally owned property at Tomah, including all buildings thereon, formerly used as an Indian school, upon such terms and conditions as the Governor shall first approve: Be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Department of the Interior, to both Houses of Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a resolution of the City Council of Cambridge, Mass., favoring amendment of the W. P. A. Act by repealing the provision establishing the so-called 18-month lay-off or amendment of that provision so that on termination of the 30-day furlough period each W. P. A. worker who is eligible shall be restored